



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

upon the land and receives the injury by playing with the turntable. An invitation cannot be implied from the fact that the turntable, designed for another purpose, furnishes a place for play.

Ludlow, J., dissenting. *Del., L. & W. R. Co. v. Reich*, 40 Atl. (N. J.) 682
Dixon, Ludlow and Krurger, J. J., dissenting, held similarly.

DAMAGES—DEATH OF STEPFATHER—RIGHT OF ACTION—MARSHALL V. MACON SASH, DOOR & LUMBER CO.—30 S. E. (Ga.) 571. Civil Code, sec. 3828, giving, "A widow, or if no widow, a child or children," a right to recover "for the homicide of the husband or parent," *held*, not to give a child such right of action for the homicide of its stepfather. Although in *Holloway v. Holloway*, 86 Ga. 576, 12 S. E. 943, it was held that one who undertakes to care for stepchildren is the head of a family, under the homestead law, yet the present Statute is in derogation of the common law, and must be strictly construed.

DAMAGES—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—LIABILITY FOR NEGLIGENCE OF SERVANTS.—CONNELLY ET UX. V. MAYOR, etc., OF CITY OF NASHVILLE., 46 S. W. Rep. 565. When plaintiff receives personal injury as the result of the negligent acts of the driver of a street sprinkling cart owned and operated by the City, it was *held* that the City is not liable for such negligent acts, since it is thereby engaged in the discharge of a governmental duty in promoting the general health, as distinguished from a duty purely corporate or ministerial.

DAMAGES—NEGLECT OF GRAVES.—GEORGE V. CYPRESS HILLS CEMETERY, 52 N. Y. Supp. 1097.—Plaintiff in visiting the grave of her husband, situated in what was called the "public ground," in defendant's cemetery, was poisoned by poison ivy growing thereon. Defendant was not hired to give special care to the grave, and only mowed and cleared up the ground once or twice a year. It did not appear that the ivy had been growing there for any great length of time, or that defendant knew of its presence. *Held*, defendant was not liable on the ground of negligence. Woodward, and Hatch, J. J., dissent in lengthy opinion, citing especially *Crowhurst v. Burial Board*, 4 Exch. Div. 5, where the cemetery was held responsible for the death of plaintiff's horse, which had browsed on the leaves of yew trees planted in the cemetery, on the analogy of *Fletcher v. Rylands*, L. R. 1 Exch. 265, at page 279.

ENLISTMENT MINOR—SOLOMON SHERIFF V. DAVENPORT—87 Fed., Rep. 318. The provision of the United States Statutes, R. S. 1117, requiring the written consent of a parent or guardian to the enlistment of a minor, is for the benefit of the parent or guardian, and confers no privilege on the minor.

EQUITY—JURISDICTION—INJUNCTION—SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE.—STANDARD FASHION CO. V. SIEGEL-COOPER CO. ET AL., 52 N. Y. Suppl. 433. A court of equity cannot decree specific performance of a contract when the business involved would be of a continuous nature, and thus brought under the management of the court; but it will enjoin the violation of a negative covenant by which defendant agreed "not to sell or allow to be sold on its premises during the duration of this contract any other make of paper patterns." *Fargo v. Railroad Co.*, 23 N. Y. Supp. 360, cited as sustaining this view in its reasoning, although opposed in its result. See also *Singer Sewing Mach. Co. v. Union Buttonhole and Embroidery Co.*, Fed. Cas. No. 12,904; *Chicago & A. Ry. Co. v. N. Y., L. E. & W. R. Co.*, 24 Fed. 521; *Pomeroy Eq. Juris.*,